

**IOWAccess Advisory Council  
Meeting Minutes of July 9, 2008, 10:00 AM  
Grimes Building, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, State Board Room**

**D r a f t**

Present: Richard Neri, Barbara Corson, Kathleen Richardson, Beth Baldwin, Terrence Neuzil, Terri Selberg, Dawn Ainger, Dan McGinn, Glen Dickinson

Absent: Tom Gronstal, Sheila Castaneda, Lawrence Lentz, Ron Wieck, Jeff Danielson, Vicki Lensing, Carmine Boal

Guests: John Gillispie, Diane Van Zante, Malcolm Huston, Mark Uhrin, Tracy Smith, Robin Harlow, Sharon Tattman, Rick Hindman

Council Chair, Dick Neri, opened the meeting at 10:03 a.m. and noted that a quorum of members was present.

1. Introductions – Dick Neri, Chair.

All council members and guests introduced themselves. The Council received correspondence from Andrew Smith, tendering his resignation due to a move to Washington, D.C.

Correspondence was also received from Mollie Anderson, Director of the Department of Administrative Services, asking the Council to revisit its funding recommendations from the May meeting. The Council is advisory in nature, with ultimate approval residing with Director Anderson. Her letter expressed concern about a disproportionate distribution of funds and suggested that the Council consider a more quantitative method for rating projects. The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) has received a significant amount of IOWAccess funds. Mollie's intent is to address the inequity. Rick Hindman, DNR CIO, commented that DNR has typically invested a great amount of time and resources to the IOWAccess funding process; as well, it appears that no other agency has gone without funding because DNR projects were funded. The funding situation has changed recently. Prior to this, it was rare to have a project rejected; now the Council must decide which projects move forward and which do not. Mollie believes part of the consideration should be which agencies have received funding and which haven't. That is not the sole consideration, but should be taken into account. DNR is currently in stage three of the project that is before the Council. Is it appropriate to change course in mid stream? At the May meeting, there was some question whether the Council denied the BLIC project in favor of the DNR project; Council members disagreed with that conclusion and stated that it was incorrect. The Council's charter is to get information to the citizens of the State. Some agencies are more prone to that mission than others.

2. Discussion of Quantitative Scoring Mechanism – Dick Neri, Chair turned the meeting over to Malcolm Huston, IOWAccess Manager, who facilitated the discussion.

The purpose of this morning's meeting is to develop a more systematic approach. One idea is to use existing return on investment (ROI) criteria as a foundation. Until now, there has been no criterion at the concept paper (first) stage with which to assign a ranking. There is already an ROI component built into the second and third stages (just recently approved), but it really hasn't been used. One frame of reference for the individual steps might be:

Step 1: Is it a good project? What's the benefit to the citizens?

Step 2: Now that we've decided it's a good project, how much do we want to spend?

Step 3: Do we still want to continue?

#### Other Ideas:

- Consideration should be given to what other sources the sponsor has pursued.
- Develop a priority board just to get in the door. It gives sponsors an idea where their concept is weak, so they can rework it.
- Utilize the concept of matching dollars. At the state level, there may not be financial matching, but there could be resource matching.

#### Proposed criteria check list:

- Is there a statutory requirement – also need to determine whether it is new or an enhancement to an existing statutory requirement.
- Does it improve customer service – maybe the wording for this criterion needs to be more aligned with improving citizen access to government information.
- Impact to citizens/business
- Is it a gateway for one stop electronic access to government information and transactions?
- Project participants – is there collaboration involving more than one entity, state/local government?
- Risk – there are all kinds of risks: technical, political, business. Should risk be a factor?
- Experience and past performance – what is the agency's maturity level? Was previous money awarded to the agency well spent or not well spent? At the concept phase, this consideration may be inappropriate; the initial phase should be selling you on the idea.  
NOTE: Decided to drop this criterion.
- Funding requirements – NOTE: Decided to drop.
- Additional funding source – requestor must have some form of match. This should not be limited to a monetary match, but could be a commitment of resources. Agencies that commit money/resources to a project are more likely to complete it. Did the requestor try to get additional funding? Are transaction-based fees possible?
- Should the concept paper only look at benefits and not cost? Should the requestor be able to substantiate cost savings upfront? There may be a huge benefit to the citizens, but little to no cost savings. Maybe there should be two sets of scores, one on a benefit basis, the other on a cost basis. Both facets are important.
- Capability Maturity – NOTE: Do not include in criteria for first phase.
- IOWAccess Share Criteria – ratio of agency project to all projects. This would rank the proposed project relative to other proposals on several dimensions.

Is it feasible to create a pool of projects that are reviewed periodically? When the Council reviews and approves one project, it has no notion of others that are forthcoming. Having a periodic approval process would level the playing field a bit more.

Mark Uhrin and Malcolm Huston explained the difference between cash projections and project obligations. It may be practical to let the Council know how much cash it has to spend and to make decisions based on that and let ITE/DAS worry about cash flow issues. Once the first phase of a project has been approved, it becomes difficult not to fund continuing phases, however each phase of a project is supposed to stand on its own merit. What do you do about agencies that come back for more funding because the estimate was insufficient or the circumstances change? That is a dilemma. How do you hold agencies accountable for the use of the money? Barb Corson proposed that Malcolm address that issue in the proposed criteria check list for the Council's overall consideration. After further discussion, Council members reached a decision not to rank this item, but to include it in an area of "council recommendations."

Absent resolution of the funding criteria, what approach should the Council take at this afternoon's meeting? It may be best to informally incorporate the criteria into decision-making, with the intent to move forward on formal criteria.

3. Wrap Up and Adjourn – Dick Neri, Chair.  
The meeting drew to a close at 12:55 p.m. in order to facilitate movement to the afternoon agenda, scheduled to begin at 1:00 p.m.